```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
 2
             FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
 3
                      EASTERN DIVISION
 4
 5
     IN RE: NATIONAL
                                  : MDL NO. 2804
 6
     PRESCRIPTION OPIATE
     LITIGATION
 7
 8
     THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO : CASE NO.
                                  : 1:17-MD-2804
     ALL CASES
 9
                                     Hon. Dan A.
10
                                     Polster
11
12
                      February 8, 2019
13
         HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL - SUBJECT TO FURTHER
14
                   CONFIDENTIALITY REVIEW
15
                    Continued videotaped deposition
16
    of STEPHEN MAYS taken pursuant to notice, was
17
    held at the law offices of Reed Smith LLP, Three
    Logan Square, 1717 Arch Street, Suite 3100,
18
    Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, beginning at 11:12
    a.m., on the above date, before Ann Marie
    Mitchell, a Federally Approved Certified Realtime
19
    Reporter, Registered Diplomate Reporter,
20
    Registered Merit Reporter and Notary Public.
21
22
                 GOLKOW LITIGATION SERVICES
23
               877.370.3377 ph | 917.591.5672 fax
                      deps@golkow.com
2.4
```

```
Justice they were wrong. Correct?
 1
 2
                    MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.
 3
                    THE WITNESS: I don't know.
 4
    BY MR. PIFKO:
 5
             Ο.
                    Sitting here today, you're not
 6
    aware of anyone responding to the Department of
 7
    Justice in connection with this and saying the
 8
    sales figures you're providing in your letter are
 9
    incorrect.
10
                    Would you agree with that?
11
                    MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.
12
                    THE WITNESS: Again, I don't know
             what was said.
13
14
    BY MR. PIFKO:
15
                    What was your title at this time?
             Ο.
16
                    2007, I would have -- I believe I
             Α.
    was director of regulatory affairs.
17
                    Were the policies and procedures
18
             Ο.
    at the Orlando facility consistent with the
19
20
    company's policies around the country?
21
                    MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.
22
                    THE WITNESS: Yes, they were.
23
    BY MR. PIFKO:
```

So with respect to diversion

Q.

24

```
1
                   MS. McCLURE: Objection, asked
 2
            and answered.
 3
                   THE WITNESS: Would that be prior
 4
            to the suspension?
 5
    BY MR. PIFKO:
 6
            O. Yes.
 7
            A. Is that what you're asking?
 8
            Q.
                  Yes.
 9
            Α.
                   As I recall, it would be the same
    as any of the other facilities.
10
            Q. Okay. So at the time this letter
11
12
    was sent, AmerisourceBergen's diversion control
    systems were the same at all of its distribution
13
14
    centers. Correct?
                   MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.
15
16
                   THE WITNESS: That's what I
17
            recall, yes.
    BY MR. PIFKO:
18
19
            Q. So anything occurring at this
    Orlando facility could be occurring at any other
20
21
    distribution center. Correct?
                   MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.
22
23
                   THE WITNESS: I disagree.
24
    BY MR. PIFKO:
```

```
What do you disagree?
 1
            Ο.
 2
                   Because they're a different
            Α.
    customer base, different region of the country.
 3
 4
             0.
                   But with respect to
 5
    AmerisourceBergen's procedures, the same things
 6
    that are occurring at this facility are the same
 7
    thing that are occurring at other facilities.
 8
    Correct?
 9
                    MS. McCLURE: Objection to form.
10
                    THE WITNESS: As far as our
11
            procedures and how -- our policies and
12
            procedures, yes, they're -- they would be
13
            the same for all of the distribution
14
            centers.
15
    BY MR. PIFKO:
16
                   Okay. Did AmerisourceBergen
            0.
    employ any sort of different system to monitor
17
    internet pharmacies as opposed to retail
18
19
    pharmacies or chain pharmacies?
20
                    MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.
21
                    THE WITNESS: No. As far as a
22
            system itself, no.
23
    BY MR. PIFKO:
24
                   So AmerisourceBergen's system
             Q.
```

```
used to monitor internet pharmacies was the same
 1
    system that it used to monitor retail and chain
 2
 3
    pharmacies. Correct?
 4
                    MS. McCLURE: Objection, form.
 5
                    THE WITNESS: Well, we weren't
 6
             specifically monitoring internet
 7
            pharmacies. We were monitoring our
 8
            customers, our pharmacy customers.
 9
    BY MR. PIFKO:
10
                    And that system that was used was
             Q.
    the same for all customers, regardless of the
11
12
    type of customers. Correct?
13
                    MS. McCLURE: Objection to form,
14
            asked and answered.
15
                    THE WITNESS: As I recall, yes.
16
    BY MR. PIFKO:
17
             0.
                    Let's go to page 2 of Exhibit 1.
18
            Α.
                    Okay.
19
                    So looking at paragraph 4, it
             Q.
    says, the bottom of paragraph 4, "Respondent
20
21
    distributed hydrocodone under the following
22
    circumstances that should have alerted Respondent
23
    that the pharmacies were diverting hydrocodone."
```

Do you see that?

24